



US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5



514229

# STATE OF MINNESOTA

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, III  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

ST. PAUL 55155

March 14, 1985

ADDRESS REPLY TO:  
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE  
POLLUTION CONTROL DIVISION  
1935 WEST COUNTY ROAD B-2  
ROSEVILLE, MN 55113  
TELEPHONE: (612) 296-7342

The Honorable Paul A. Magnuson  
United States District Judge  
United States District Court  
754 United States Courthouse  
316 N. Robert Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101

Re: United States v. Reilly Tar & Chemical Corporation  
Civil No. 4-80-469  
Civil No. 4-85-310

Dear Judge Magnuson:

Due to inadvertent clerical error, the enclosed Table of Contents was omitted from the "Memorandum of the State of Minnesota in Response to Both (1) Memorandum of Reilly Tar & Chemical Corporation in Opposition to the State of Minnesota's Motion for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint (Civil No. 4-80-469) and (2) Reilly's Memorandum in Support of Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, Order to Show Cause, And Preliminary Injunction (Civil No. 4-85-310), which was delivered to you on March 13, 1985.

I am sorry for any inconvenience this may have caused.


Very truly yours,

LISA R. TIEGEL  
Special Assistant  
Attorney General

LRT:mah

Enc.

cc: All counsel of record  
Hon. Crane Winton



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
ARGUMENT . . . . .	5
I.    IN ENACTING MERLA, THE LEGISLATURE ESTABLISHED A STATUTORY FRAMEWORK IN WHICH ADMINISTRATIVE AND LITIGATIVE PROCESSES WORK TOGETHER TO ACCOMPLISH AN EFFICIENT AND TIMELY CLEAN UP OF A HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME PROTECTING THE LEGITIMATE INTERESTS OF A PERSON WHO MAY BE ASKED TO UNDERTAKE THAT CLEAN UP. . .	5
II.   THE STATE FOLLOWED THE APPROPRIATE ADMINISTRATIVE STEPS NECESSARY TO MAKE THE MERLA AMENDMENT AND THERE IS NO EVIDENCE WHICH SUPPORTS REILLY'S ACCUSATION THAT THE MPCA'S MOTIVES IN ISSUING THE RFRA WERE "TERRORISTIC" OR "COERCIVE." . . . . .	10
III.  REILLY'S MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO THE STATE'S MOTION TO ADD MERLA AS A CLAIM IN THIS LITIGATION FAILS TO PROVIDE A LEGITIMATE BASIS FOR DENYING THE STATE'S MOTION TO AMEND ITS COMPLAINT: UNDER THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, FED. R. CIV. P. 15(a), THE AMENDMENT SHOULD BE PERMITTED. . . . .	17
A.  Reilly's assertion that the State has unduly delayed the filing of its MERLA motion is without factual support and provides no basis for this Court to deny the State's motion to amend . . . . .	18
B.  Reilly's assertion that it will suffer prejudice if the amendment is permitted is founded on Reilly's erroneous understanding of the applicable law and the Court's Case Management Order. . . . .	20
C.  Reilly's final argument, that the penalty provision of the RFRA has an in terrorem impact is unfounded and has no relevance to the question of whether it is appropriate to amend the litigation to add the MERLA claim . . . . .	26

IV.	THE PENALTY PROVISION OF MERLA IS CONSISTENT WITH THE DUE PROCESS REQUIREMENTS OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. . . . .	28
A.	The issue before this Court is not whether the MERLA penalty provision would be constitutional if there was no process provided before the MPCA Board issued the RFRA, but whether the process which was provided satisfied the requirements of the Fourteenth Amendment as applied by the Courts. . . . .	28
B.	Recent Supreme Court decisions establish the principle that something less than a full blown adjudicatory hearing held prior to agency action may be sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Fourteenth Amendment . . . . .	29
C.	The procedures provided by the MPCA Board prior to the issuance of its RFRA satisfy the requirements of due process as enunciated in Mathews v. Eldridge . . . .	34
D.	The concerns of the Aminoil court that penalties not attach for good faith actions of responsible parties is satisfied here and there is, therefore, no justification for the issuance of the preliminary injunction. . . . .	36
CONCLUSION	. . . . .	39